

service announcements, seminars, conferences, and other public education activities, they are working successfully to increase public respect and understanding of our wildlife resources.

A project recently announced by the Center is particularly exciting. With the support of Plum Creek Timber Co., the Center for Wildlife Information and Columbia Falls Junior High, located close to the western gateway of Glacier National Park, are working to develop a bear-awareness and wildlife stewardship education program. Under the direction of Columbia Falls Junior High's principal Neal Wedum, students and teachers will write and design educational materials and teaching units on black bear and grizzly bear identification, techniques for safe hiking and camping in bear country, and techniques for viewing and photographing wildlife safely and responsibly. Students will also develop an educational unit about partnerships between corporations, communities, and wildlife management agencies in Montana's Seeley-Swan Grizzly Bear Corridor.

In closing, Mr. President, I commend everyone involved in this remarkable effort: Chuck Bartlebaugh, Kris Backes of Plum Creek, and Principal Wedum, to name just a few. Congratulations and good work.

THE BUDGET

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, the topic of the day, the topic of the week, the topic of the month, is clearly the budget, the fiscal crisis this country has been in for a lot longer period than we care to remember. There has been discussion on this this morning. Obviously, the decision now is in the President's hands.

Republicans have clearly defined what they attempt to do. It is anything but an extreme measure. The President, if he will simply follow his own admonitions to us, will find it very difficult to disagree and veto the Republican plan that is being sent to him.

The President called for a 7-year budget with real numbers. We gave him a 7-year budget with real numbers. We are asking him for a commitment to that; frankly, a commitment to simply negotiate how that is achieved in return for a resolution which would provide funding for the Government so Government workers can come back to work on Monday.

BOSNIA

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I would like to divert from that just for a moment because, were it not for the overshadowing presence of the budget debate, which is appropriate, I suspect we may be on this floor debating an issue that is of great significance and great importance.

As we speak, the United States is leading an effort in Dayton, OH, to attempt to reach some kind of peace agreement between the warring fac-

tions in Bosnia. That has been an elusive goal, one which different parties and different factions have been attempting over nearly a 600-year period of time; in this latest conflict, 4 years of serious engagement with disastrous and tragic consequences for hundreds of thousands of people, if not millions of people, in that part of the world.

But, if we have learned anything, I think, from our recent history in terms of the United States involvement in conflicts abroad, it is that any kind of involvement, and particularly a long-term involvement, anything exceeding just a matter of days, ultimately cannot succeed without the support of the American people.

That support is expressed through their elected representatives. The President has said and Congress has said that it is appropriate for Congress to examine the conditions upon which any U.S. troops will be subject to deployment to a foreign land, particularly one in which potential conflict and potential threat to their health and safety and life exist.

At this point, hopefully, we are nearing a real peace agreement in Dayton. I have some very deep concerns about the nature of that agreement and whether it can even be accurately described as a peace agreement. But, unfortunately, the President of the United States for whatever reason some time ago, and on numerous occasions, has made commitments to deploy troops as soon as this agreement is reached.

There have been some recent indications that the President is willing to let Congress take a look at, examine, and analyze the peace agreement but no commitment that, even if we disagree, the troops will not be sent. In fact, there is pretty good indication that an advance party of up to 2,000 American troops will be sent there to sort of hold the line while the so-called 2-week "period of examination" passes. The President hopes for congressional support and authorization. He has not yet received it, nor will he unless he is able to go before the American people and go before this Congress and make a compelling case for use of United States troops on the ground in Bosnia. That case, I suggest, has not been made, and has not even been attempted to be presented to the American people a cogent, logical, understandable reason why 20,000 uniformed troops of the United States Armed Forces need to be inserted into the conflict in Bosnia. The President may intend to do that. I do not know. He has waited a dangerously long time.

The argument that the administration has made, feeble as it is, is that it is necessary for two reasons: One, to contain the spread of the conflict to other areas which involve other NATO allies which eventually will pull in all of Europe. There is little reason to suspect that will happen. It has not in a 4-year period of time.

What we have essentially looked at is a civil war within a confined border of three factions fighting for land which they have fought for for nearly 600 years—avenging tragedies, avenging killings, avenging land seizures and private property seizures which have taken place over a significant period of time. Even if spreading beyond the current borders were a real possibility, there are strategies, containment strategies, that NATO could employ which are far different and involve far less risk than inserting 20,000 American troops and 40,000 NATO troops for a total of 60,000 onto the ground in the middle of the conflict that currently exists in Bosnia.

The second reason the administration postulates is that our involvement with troops on the ground is necessary to maintain the integrity of NATO. I think that even that is a questionable proposition.

In a recent article in Time magazine by Charles Krauthammer he talks about that very point, saying, "Of course, the single most powerful argument in favor of deployment invokes NATO: to renege on this promise of American relief for our NATO allies already trapped in Bosnia in a fruitless 'peacekeeping' mission." He asserts that it "would be the worst blow Clinton has yet dealt"—I am quoting—"to NATO cohesion."

"Whatever the strategic policy of having our troops in Bosnia, the argument goes, our NATO allies want us to take the lead on the ground, and we promised that we would do that."

But, as Krauthammer goes on to explain, our recent history indicates that one of two things are going to probably happen. Either we will suffer a loss of life—either we will suffer a situation which is far different than what could be described as peace, and, therefore, without having gotten the commitment of the Congress, or the commitment of the American people, we will call for a withdrawal of those troops which would be a serious blow to the integrity of NATO—or it may result in a long-term deployment and commitment of those troops which we have not again made the case for, nor do I think we can begin to expect American support for, a long-term commitment to that.

Either one of those occurrences, one of which is likely to happen, could do great damage to the NATO alliance and, as Krauthammer argues, and I agree, actually do more damage than not providing troops on the ground.

The President has not defined our vital interests in that involvement. He has not defined what our objective and mission would be. He has not defined how we would exit from the situation other than to say we will be out of there within a year. I think what he means by that is that we will be out of there before the next election. It is politically not feasible, and untenable to think the troops would still be there and become an election issue. That in